

DIVISION OF OIL, GAS and MINING**Minerals Program**12/12/97

Date

Reilly Wendover - Pond VI

Operator - Project Name

M/045/002

File #

Criteria for Defining Amendments and Revisions*This policy became effective May 22, 1991*

The following policy provides clarification in determining whether a proposed change to a plan should be considered an amendment or a revision under rules R647-4-118 and R647-4-119. A revision is considered a significant change to the approved Notice of Intention or MRP and would require public notice. An amendment is considered to be a less significant change to the Notice of Intention. If the proposed change to the Mining and Reclamation Plan qualifies for three of the four categories discussed below, then the change will be considered a *revision* and addressed under rule R647-4-118. If the proposed change does not fall within three of the categories below, it will be considered an *amendment* and addressed under rule R647-4-119. The determination will be based on the following categories:

	Criteria	Comments
1	The acreage will increase by 50% of the existing acreage or 50 acres, whichever is smaller. For example, if a 10 acre site increases by 5 acres, it would then fall within this category.	NO - The entire 87,821 acres of land are bonded to be disturbed, the new pond is a portion of that which has already been bonded.
2	The surety will increase by 25% of the existing surety or \$50,000, whichever is smaller.	NO - Surety will NOT need to increase since reclamation of the pond is by natural forces and no additions or changes are being made to the processing plant.
3	The overall additional environmental impacts are considered significant, when compared with impacts already affecting the site. The degree of change would not be negligible. This determination is made after evaluating the impacts to soils, vegetation, hydrology (ground and surface), wildlife, air, or other media.	NO - Environmental impacts resulting from the new pond will NOT be significant when compared with the lack of impact resulting from the previous ponds.
4	The impacts proposed in the amendment are significant enough to warrant the need for an opportunity for public comment.	NO - Pond VI does not warrant the need for public comment since our operations are not changing.

This proposal is:

☒ an Amendment☐ a Revision